

## **MINUTES**

### **MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 57th LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION COMMITTEE ON STATE ADMINISTRATION**

**Call to Order:** By **CHAIRMAN ALLAN WALTERS**, on February 9, 2001 at 8:00 A.M., in Room 455 Capitol.

#### **ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:**

Rep. Allan Walters, Chairman (R)  
Rep. Debby Barrett, Vice Chairman (R)  
Rep. Tom Dell, Vice Chairman (D)  
Rep. Norma Bixby (D)  
Rep. Dee Brown (R)  
Rep. Donald L. Hedges (R)  
Rep. Hal Jacobson (D)  
Rep. Larry Jent (D)  
Rep. Larry Lehman (R)  
Rep. Ralph Lenhart (D)  
Rep. Gay Ann Masolo (R)  
Rep. Alan Olson (R)  
Rep. Holly Raser (D)  
Rep. Rick Ripley (R)  
Rep. Clarice Schrumpf (R)  
Rep. Frank Smith (D)

**Members Excused:** Rep. Michelle Lee (D)  
Rep. Douglas Mood (R)

**Members Absent:** None.

**Staff Present:** Sheri Heffelfinger, Legislative Branch  
Ruthie Padilla, Committee Secretary

**Please Note:** These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

**Committee Business Summary:**

Hearing(s) & Date(s) Posted: SB 123, 2/1/2001; HB 450,  
2/1/2001; HJR 15, 2/1/2001  
Executive Action: SB 37; HB 450

## 010209STH Hm1.wpd

candidates who can effectively represent the voting public as a continuing body. This bill is proposing a constitutional amendment that will not increase the length of the session, but actually will shorten the session. They would meet for 30 days in the odd numbered years to establish the state budget and 60 days in the even numbered years to take up general legislation. The total number of days over the two year period could not exceed the 90 days they now meet. This will make it easier to find good people who could commit themselves to this task of government due to a shorter time span away from their home, job or business. This proposal will not increase the amount of money the taxpayers are presently paying for the legislature. No more money would be appropriated than what is currently spent. Annual session will develop a more professional, more efficient, and more responsive legislature.

**Proponents' Testimony:**

***{Tape : 1; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 15.1}***

**Vernen Bertelsen, Montana Senior Citizens Association.** said they are the largest in-state senior organization in the state of Montana. They support having annual session of the legislature. In 1975, he spent four months with the legislature. At that time he was a rancher and calving season started while he was away from home and because he was not there to take care of the operation, he lost a lot of calves. If there had been annual session he could have been there for the calving season. Even more than that, he likes the idea of all legislators being able to be involved with the budgeting. He was never on the committees who dealt with the budget and felt at sea when HB 2 would come up for vote. It is important for each legislator to know how the money was allocated to the different departments of government and to be able to have input into how it is taken care of. It is ridiculous to believe we can run this state with the size of operation they have and only be here every other year. It has been proven it does not work. Departments have large over-runs in the money they spend. He urges the support of this piece of legislation.

**Roberta CrossGuns, Montana Senior Citizens Association,** said all the reasons to have an annual session have already been well stated. It would be a wonderful thing to think they could come to the Capitol every year to see and visit with the legislators to visit and talk about their issues and their priorities. This would make Montana so unique.

**Opponents' Testimony:**

**{Tape : 1; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 22}**

**Lorna Karn, Montana Farm Bureau Federation** said in 1972-73, the Montana Farm Bureau went to the supreme court to try to overturn the new constitutional provision for annual sessions. There were issues they did not like. Since that time, the Montana Farm Bureau has felt that annual sessions are not the way to go. The main reason is because bills could be transferred from one session to the next. They also feel there is an additional cost to the taxpayers and farmers and ranchers who already pay a lot of property taxes. There would be additional start-up costs to an annual session and feels the people of Montana do not want to have that additional expense. She submitted written testimony on behalf of **Patrick McNulty**. **EXHIBIT (sth33a01)**

**Questions from Committee Members and Responses:**

**{Tape : 1; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 27.4}**

**REPRESENTATIVE BROWN** stated **Vernen Bertelsen** felt with annual sessions farmers and ranchers would be able to serve in the legislature and be part of the process and then asked **Loran Karn** to address the concerns of the ranchers she supports. **Lorna Karn** replied that there are farmers and ranchers on both sides of the issue. There are people who feel shorter sessions are better because they can participate in it, but on the other hand there are people who feel just the opposite. It depends on their operation. As a whole, members of the Farm Bureau Federation are opposed to annual sessions.

**REPRESENTATIVE LENHART** asked if there was any history of the number of revenue bill verses the number of general appropriation bills. **Dave Boyer, Legislative Services Division**, replied in a typical session there are about 150 or fewer revenue bills and there are less than 100 appropriation bill. **REPRESENTATIVE LENHART** asked if 30 days would be adequate for revenue bills and would not have the need to go into a special session. **SENATOR BOHLINGER** said after he consulted with our legislative fiscal analyst and **REPRESENTATIVE DAVE LEWIS**, the former budget director, they both felt very comfortable it could be done in 30 days. He also met with the budget director of the state of Wyoming who has a format similar to this one but only allows 20 days for the establishment of their budget and feels it works fine.

**REPRESENTATIVE DELL** stated that **Lorna Karn** felt there would be additional costs with this process and then asked **SENATOR BOHLINGER** if he felt this would happen. **SENATOR BOHLINGER**

replied the cost is driven by the days the legislature is in session. The number of days will not exceed 90. He does not see how the cost would be greater due to having an annual session. He also feels with the possibility of special sessions and an average cost of \$44,000.00 a day for special sessions, it is likely with an annual session the need for special sessions will be diminished considerably. This would be an opportunity to save the taxpayers some money.

**REPRESENTATIVE OLSON** asked if revenue estimates could be handled in 30 days. **SENATOR BOHLINGER** replied revenue estimates is an ongoing issue and that adequate time would be available for this.

**REPRESENTATIVE LEHMAN** asked how annual sessions would affect term limits and if each session would be described as a term. **SENATOR BOHLINGER** said a house member is elected for a two year term. Meeting annually would not change the time you are elected to serve. It would just give two opportunities to be of service to their constituents as opposed to the current one.

**REPRESENTATIVE SMITH** asked if sessions every year would cut down on the expenses of interim committees. **SENATOR BOHLINGER** replied if they were meeting annually there would be a lesser need for some of the interim committee work.

**REPRESENTATIVE HEDGES** asked if there are bills that are both policy and finance, for example the speed limit. If we enact the policy portion of the bill one year, would we wait until the next year to fund it. How would that work? **SENATOR BOHLINGER** stated he did not know, but felt rules could be drafted to address those concerns. **REPRESENTATIVE HEDGES** then asked why would they want to restrict themselves in such a manner when they know from experience that 1/3 of the legislation is both policy and finance. **SENATOR BOHLINGER** replied he feels **REPRESENTATIVE HEDGE'S** concerns could be addressed through the flexibility in the bill of rulemaking authority. He realizes there will be bills that require policy and finance and they can allow for consideration. If the bill had financial issues they could take up both the policy and financial part in the same year.

**REPRESENTATIVE LENHART** asked if there had been any thought on limiting the number of bills each session. **SENATOR BOHLINGER** replied he originally wanted to limit the number of bills anybody could bring forward, but ran into some constitutional problems with that. It would be a limitation on freedom of speech and expression. He feels it would be an unworkable proposition.

**REPRESENTATIVE RIPLEY** asked how many part-time employees are currently employed with the legislature and what he felt the availability of those people would be every year. **SENATOR BOHLINGER** replied he did not know how many part-time employees currently work with the legislature but felt the State Administration Secretary could answer as to the availability. **REPRESENTATIVE RIPLEY** then asked if there have been any concerns about the legislators becoming full-time politicians with annual sessions. **SENATOR BOHLINGER** said none of his constituents have had concerns about that. In the bill it clearly states the legislature may not exceed 90 days. Meeting annually does not mean legislators are going to be professional politicians or full-time employees of state government. They are just going to be more available and more responsive to their constituents.

**REPRESENTATIVE JACOBSON** said there are a number of states who currently have annual sessions. Of those states, are any of them contemplating returning to a biennial session? **SENATOR BOHLINGER** replied he does not currently know of any state considering returning to biennial sessions verses annual.

**REPRESENTATIVE MOOD** asked if they did go to annual sessions, would everyone be placed on an appropriations committee. **SENATOR BOHLINGER** stated one of the intentions of the bill is to involve everyone in the appropriations process so they will all have an understanding of the budget process.

**Closing by Sponsor:**

*{Tape : 2; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 0}*

**REPRESENTATIVE BOHLINGER** stated the bill is to try and change the constitution to allow for annual sessions which he feels will permit them to better serve their constituents. The senior citizens group is behind the bill because they realize legislators could better represent the constituency. The farmers who opposed the constitution 26 years ago do not do business the same way they did business 26 years ago. This is a new idea he hopes the House will support and it will be allowed to go to the voters.

**HEARING ON HB 450**

**Sponsor:** **REPRESENTATIVE BOB LAWSON, HD 80, WHITEFISH**

**Proponents:** Gary Marks, City of Whitefish  
Dan Keyes, City of Whitefish Parks and Recreation

**Opponents:** Ralph DeCunzo, Department of Military Affairs

**Opening Statement by Sponsor:**

*{Tape : 2; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 5.0}*

**REPRESENTATIVE BOB LAWSON, HD 80, WHITEFISH**, said the bill originated with the city of Whitefish. The purpose of the bill is to promote the potential for economic development, recreational and educational opportunities for the Whitefish area by providing for the transfer of the Whitefish Armory to the City of Whitefish for the sum of \$1.00 and other valuable considerations. In 1957 the City of Whitefish transferred the Whitefish Armory building site to the State of Montana for \$1.00 with the idea that the armory had to be built in five years and it was built. The National Guard plans to leave Whitefish and establish a new home in the Kalispell area. The armory site would complement Whitefish as a destination resort for both recreational and educational activities. He then discussed the bill and submitted written testimony on behalf of **Jeanne Fairbanks. EXHIBIT(ssth33a02)**

**Proponents' Testimony:**

*{Tape : 2; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 13.4}*

**Gary Marks, City of Whitefish**, stated this is not a bill that asks to transfer the Whitefish Armory to the City of Whitefish. It simply give them the opportunity to get in line with the process. The city does have some concerns with the plans of the Department of Military Affairs because they plan to sell the property and use those proceeds for a new facility in the city of Kalispell. The property on which the building currently sits was originally deeded to the state for \$1.00 from the city in 1957, with the idea that it would be a benefit to their community. The City of Whitefish currently re-zoned the property. The property is located in a rural area and is in a residential neighborhood. If they had not done the deal, the property would be part of the public park. They do not want to end with a situation where the building sits there empty. They would like to be able to put the property to use for their community. He submitted and discussed photographs of the affected property. **EXHIBIT(ssth33a03)**

**Dan Keyes, City of Whitefish Parks and Recreation**, submitted written testimony. **EXHIBIT(ssth33a04)**

**Opponents' Testimony:**

***{Tape : 2; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 22.2}***

**Ralph DeCunzo, Department of Military Affairs**, commented they have been a good and long standing neighbor of the city of Whitefish for over 30 years. They are simply looking at ways of being good stewards of the property by combining the forces in Whitefish of the National Guard with the forces of Kalispell. They would vacate one facility and combine both of those units into one location in Kalispell. The only reason they appear in opposition to the bill is the financial impact to the general fund. They felt the need to try and mitigate the impact of the general fund because they were building the Kalispell and Bozeman facilities. They urged the committee to not pass this legislation and if they do, to exclude Bozeman from the bill.

**Questions from Committee Members and Responses:**

***{Tape : 2; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 25.2}***

**REPRESENTATIVE BROWN** stated in the bill on page 1, line 6, it states "the property would be used for a public purpose or sold", and in written testimony from **Jeanne Fairbanks** it states "this property cannot be sold". She then asked for clarification if the property can or cannot be sold. **REPRESENTATIVE LAWSON** stated those are two different sales. The bill is referring to the Department of Military Affairs selling the building and the letter from **Jeanne Fairbanks** is stating that if the property is transferred to the city of Whitefish, the city of Whitefish could not sell the property.

**REPRESENTATIVE BROWN** asked if the armory had currently been put into agriculture zoning how is the new way that Whitefish is going to use this property within the agricultural zoning idea. **Gary Marks** replied their agriculture zoning for Whitefish provides for many sorts of uses in the zone. One of those uses are public uses, parks or recreational type facilities.

**REPRESENTATIVE BROWN** stated she understands boys and girls club, similar to what is being done already in Flathead County, is what is being proposed. She then asked if anyone had looked at the program outside of their community to bring it into a different facility other than the armory. **Dan Keyes** commented that the representative from the organization mentioned has not been contacted and is not sure where they are currently located. At this time, in talking with representatives throughout the city of

Whitefish, there is a lack of facilities for the development of any recreational programs they would like.

**REPRESENTATIVE OLSON** asked if they were to take possession of the building is there money to fund what they plan. **Dan Keyes** replied at this time the funds are marked for this because they do not know what is going to happen with the Whitefish Armory facility, however, there is an overwhelming number of donations and sponsorships throughout the community as well as volunteers toward parks and recreation in general. If they do get the building, he feels there will be no problem getting volunteers or sponsors for this. **REPRESENTATIVE OLSON** then asked if there was any room for negotiation with the Department of Military Affairs rather than only paying a dollar to relieve some of their concerns. **Dan Keyes** said if they could get the facility for \$1.00, it would be great. However, if they could come up with an arrangement that was equitable for both the Department of Military Affairs and the city of Whitefish, they could possibly work something out.

**REPRESENTATIVE RASER** asked for further clarification on the transfer and circumstances of armories in other places. **Ralph DeCunzo** said when they decide to vacate a facility they go through a process of determining why and have a reason for it. They then generally look to see if the communities could use the facility; they then go through the correct process and following approval it is then transferred from the state to the local jurisdiction. The process does take a long time. **REPRESENTATIVE RASER** then asked what the difference is in the current situation and why were they not proceeding in the same fashion. **Ralph DeCunzo** said the only reason is because they feel the responsible thing to do is try and come up with a way to mitigate the impact to the general fund by selling this particular property.

**REPRESENTATIVE HEDGES** stated education and after-school programs have a direct bearing on the availability of the building. He then asked if they could apply for a \$200,000.00 grant to buy the building for the after-school programs. **Gary Marks** commented it is an excellent idea may need to look into.

**REPRESENTATIVE OLSON** asked how much revenue they receive off their resort tax. **Gary Marks** stated the resort tax brings in just under \$1 million year and the voters have set the limitation on how the funds can be used. Twenty-five percent is returned as a rebate on their property taxes. Sixty-five percent is invested in the streets and another five percent is set aside for Parks and Recreation. Those funds would be available for the rehabilitation of the building, however, five percent of \$1 million is \$50,000.00 and is not enough to purchase the property.

**REPRESENTATIVE DELL** asked if this is a building in high demand and do they anticipate they will have no problems selling the property. **Ralph DeCunzo** replied he could not answer the question because they have not put the property on the market yet.

**REPRESENTATIVE DELL** said he has concerns of the building sitting there empty for a long period of time and asked if they have any concerns about it. **Ralph DeCunzo** said he did not have any concerns due to having a very aggressive maintenance program. The building is not empty; they are currently using it for storage of the equipment that has been allocated by the federal government to the unit that drilled there. They are still heating and maintaining the building and feel it will go on the market in the next 6-8 months. **REPRESENTATIVE DELL** then asked if there is something that could be done with the bill to ensure some flexibility that the community would be at the top of the list to have the opportunity to obtain the building at a reasonable cost. **RALPH DeCunzo** replied they are governed by statutes and guidelines of State Lands that has the requirement of getting fair market value at the time the facility is put on the market. They have very little flexibility.

**REPRESENTATIVE RASER** asked for an estimated loss of revenue to the city, if the property was sold to another party rather than the National Guard for \$1.00. **Gary Marks** said it is a difficult question to answer due to a 43 year period that has transpired since the dollar transaction. Off the top of his head and through other appraisals and deals that have transpired through that area, he estimates it would be in the neighborhood of \$100,000.00 - \$150,000.00.

**REPRESENTATIVE BROWN** asked what some of the benefits of having the military presence in the Whitefish are for the past 40 years. **Gary Marks** replied that first and foremost was having a state facility in their community.

**Closing by Sponsor:**

***{Tape : 2; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 18.8}***

**REPRESENTATIVE LAWSON** said the bill is addressing economic development and community development for the city of Whitefish. There have been other transfers that have transpired from armories. Turning this armory into a community resource is certainly a benefit that fulfills a public purpose.

**HEARING ON HJR 15**

**Sponsor:** **REPRESENTATIVE BOB LAWSON, HD 80, WHITEFISH**

**Proponents:** **Jane Karas, Flathead County Community College**

**Opponents:** None

**Opening Statement by Sponsor:**

***{Tape : 2; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 21.4}***

**REPRESENTATIVE BOB LAWSON, HD 80, WHITEFISH**, stated this is a request for an interim study of the laws governing community colleges. The goal for the study is to develop an understanding of origins of state law affecting community colleges and to develop a set of recommendations for Montana's community colleges which would guide them into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

**Proponents' Testimony:**

***{Tape : 2; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 26.2}***

**Jane Karas, Flathead County Community College**, said she is representing all three community colleges in the state of Montana. The current language in the law is confusing. The average age of their students is 31 and 15% have bachelor degrees. Under the current law community colleges fall under both the elementary and high school provisions as well as the provisions of higher education. Past independent audits of the community colleges have identified issues of clarification because of differences in the two different provisions in the language of the law. Community colleges fulfill different needs

in the community of those in the elementary and high school districts. They are in support of the resolution to clarify the language.

**Questions from Committee Members and Responses:**

***{Tape : 2; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 28.9}***

**REPRESENTATIVE OLSON** asked what are some of the problems they are looking to address. **Jane Karas** said there are a number of issues. One is the notice of final budget meetings. Community colleges begin their yearly operations earlier than the elementary and high school districts. The timing of the budget meetings and notices are an issue because under the provisions of the law, they are under that of the elementary and high school district. Another issue is the statutory definition of budgeted funds, which is confusing because it also falls under the elementary and high school districts. The third issue is the donation investments and duties and powers of trustees. Again, their responsibilities are much different than the elementary and high school districts.

**REPRESENTATIVE HEDGES** asked how large of a scope the study would be. **Jane Karas** said the study would be to look at the language in the Montana Codes for community colleges to determine what areas need clarification. She did not know exactly what areas would be addressed but assumed the committee would set out what needed to be addressed.

**REPRESENTATIVE RIPLEY** asked since they were already aware of the specific problems why do a study instead of addressing the problem. **Jane Karas** said there are a number of complex issues that impact the community colleges in terms of the language under the school districts. It was felt it would be better addressed over a period of time to look at the issues because they are so complex.

**Closing by Sponsor:**

***{Tape : 3; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 2.4}***

**REPRESENTATIVE LAWSON** said they were going to try to address only certain specific areas of the main issues identified, but felt it would be better to look at the whole overall scheme and put it in line all at once.

**EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HJR 15**

***{Tape : 3; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 4}***

**Motion:** REP. BROWN moved that HJR 15 DO PASS.

**Discussion:**

**REPRESENTATIVE MASOLO** clarified that this will go to the Interim Committee on Education. They will then choose which three studies are a top priority and do an in-depth study.

**REPRESENTATIVE LENHART** said he started teaching at a community college in 1960. At that time it was a part of the high school and when the college was separated from the high school and became it's own separate entity, they were still governed by a lot of the rules from the high school district. He feels this needs to be studied to see what still applies and what does not.

**Motion/Vote:** REP. BROWN moved that HJR 15 DO PASS. Motion carried unanimously. 18-0

**EXECUTIVE ACTION ON SB 37**

***{Tape : 3; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 10.4}***

**Motion:** REP. OLSON moved that SB 37 BE RECONSIDERED.

**Discussion:**

**REPRESENTATIVE OLSON** stated since they have tabled this bill they have allowed members of other retirement systems to return to work after retiring. They allowed district court judges who retire to return to work. He does not feel the original version of the bill of 960 hours is going to be a problem or be abused. There are times people need to be brought back to fill a short-term spot. He hopes the committee will bring the bill back with the original 960 hours.

**CHAIRMAN WALTERS** said he spoke to the sponsor of the bill who was addressing the issue of bus drivers and found out the bus drivers in his county also have a problem with running out of hours. Bus drivers are used to drive the children to school and are also used for sporting and special events. In doing so, they use up all their hours and the districts are unable to find reliable bus drivers to replace them.

**REPRESENTATIVE DELL** said one of the reasons they tabled the bill was because of retirement incentive program. Now this would be bringing them back on a part-time basis. Agency employees have told him if the bill does pass they will retire and get their pension, then return to work in a part-time capacity. He feels there is a need for new blood in government and would vote against taking the bill off the table.

**Motion:** REP. OLSON moved that **SB 37 BE RECONSIDERED**. **Vote:** Motion carried 16-1 with Dell voting no.

**Motion:** REP. HEDGES moved that the **ADOPTED AMENDMENT BE REMOVED FROM SB 37**.

**Discussion:**

**REPRESENTATIVE DELL** said he would resist a motion to remove the amendment. He does not feel the hours should be set at the maximum hours of 960 and feels these people should be very, very, very part-time rather than institutionally part-time.

**REPRESENTATIVE HEDGES** said one of the reasons he ran for office was to build flexibility into the government. He sees no conflict in the early retirement statute. This is giving responsible people the ability to execute a decision as it comes up and feels they should not be limited.

**REPRESENTATIVE BARRETT** stated when a person is hiring an individual they have the choice of who they hire. This is not giving retirees first choice or preference. It just gives the individual doing the hiring a choice of who they hire for that job.

**REPRESENTATIVE RASER** said currently the law is 640 hours and if the bill needs to be broadened, then broaden it to 808 hours to cover the bus driver's situation. If it is still a problem by the next legislation session, then broaden it to 960 hours.

**REPRESENTATIVE BROWN** stated between the 808 hours and 960 hours, it is 4 weeks difference. She feels it does not guarantee anything and just says they could return to work. She supports the 960 hours.

**REPRESENTATIVE LENHART** said the Department of Transportation will occasionally call back retirees during snow season or whatever and have a separate regulation on hours.

**Motion:** REP. HEDGES moved that the **ADOPTED AMENDMENT BE REMOVED FROM SB 37.** **Vote:** Motion **carried 15-2 with Dell and Raser voting no.**

**Motion:** REP. RIPLEY moved that **SB 37 BE CONCEPTUALLY AMENDED.**

**Discussion:**

**REPRESENTATIVE OLSON** said every bill that comes before them already has a sunset provision on it and does not see the need for an amendment to the issue.

**REPRESENTATIVE DELL** said he speaks in favor of a sunset and will support the conceptual amendment.

**REPRESENTATIVE RASER** said she is in favor of a sunset.

**REPRESENTATIVE RIPLEY** said with a sunset they will definitely be revisiting the issue and without a sunset they may or may not revisit the issue and feels the sunset is needed.

**CHAIRMAN WALTERS** they look at things every couple of years. If the bill is working he does not see the need to bring it up again and if it's not working they will hear about it anyway. He is going to vote against the sunset.

**Motion:** REP. RIPLEY moved that **SB 37 BE CONCEPTUALLY AMENDED.**  
**Vote:** Motion **failed 6-11 with Bixby, Dell, Jacobson, Lenhart, Raser, and Ripley voting aye.**

**Motion/Vote:** REP. OLSON moved that **SB 37 BE CONCURRED IN.** Motion **carried 16-1 with Dell voting no.**

**EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HB 450**

*{Tape : 3; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 5.8}*

**Motion:** REP. BROWN moved that **HB 450 DO PASS.**

**Motion:** REP. BROWN moved that **HB 450 BE CONCEPTUALLY AMENDED.**

**Discussion:**

**REPRESENTATIVE BROWN** said she wanted an amendment to remove Bozeman throughout the bill.

**REPRESENTATIVE OLSON** stated they should leave Bozeman in the bill because if they remove Bozeman that would allow them to sell the Bozeman Armory.

**Motion:** **REP. BROWN** moved **TO WITHDRAW THE MOTION** that **HB 450 DO PASS.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Adjournment: 10:45 A.M.

---

REP. ALLAN WALTERS, Chairman

---

RUTHIE PADILLA, Secretary

AW/RP

**EXHIBIT (sth33aad)**